

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/624,395

Applicant(s)

NERIISHI, KEIKO

Examiner

BJ Forman

Art Unit

1634

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) BJ Forman.

(3) _____.

(2) Drew Hissonq.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 08 November 2002.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Hissong discussed the amendments submitted in the After Final Paper No.9 in view of the Advisory Action wherein the examiner stated that the amendments potentially added new matter because the passages pointed to by Application does not support the amendments. Mr. Hissong and the examiner discussed the phrase "predetermined configuration" in view of the specification teaching of a known position for each probe on the array. The examiner stated that while the specification supports a "known" position, the specification does not support a "predetermined" position. Mr. Hissong and the examiner further discussed the meaning of the terms fixed on or within the phosphor sheet in view of the specification which teaches fixed on or within but does not teach fixed "directly" to the phosphor sheet. The examiner stated that fixed to encompasses the fixed on a gel on the phosphor sheet as taught by the prior art but the phrase "fixed directly to" further limits the attachment but this further limitation is not supported by the specification. Mr. Hissong stated that an RCE and further amendments would be filed to more clearly define the invention in view of the teaching of the specification. .